

REMARKS

Claims 16 and 19-26 are now in the case for examination.

The objection to the drawings 3e and 3f for not being included with the case as filed is corrected by the inclusion of Figure 3f, which is now labeled 3e. The references to Figure 3, as filed in the application, have been amended to refer to Figure 3a, by amendment to the specification. The Applicants argue that the submission of Figure 3f, now referred to as 3e is not new matter. Figure 3f was included in Provisional patent application 60/424,544 filed on November 7, 2002, from which the instant utility application claims priority.

The objection to the Abstract as originally filed has been overcome by the submission of a revised Abstract. Support for the new abstract appears in claims 16 and 19-26 as filed.

The objection to the reference to Figure 3 and Figure 3a in the specification has been corrected by amendment to the specification.

The objections to claims 7 and 22 have been overcome by cancellation of claim 7. The Applicants argue that claim 22 includes additional elements not covered in claim 21 and is therefore distinguishable.

The rejection of claim 2-4, and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling, is made moot by the cancellation of the claims.

The rejection of claim 2-4, and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph, for being indefinite, is made moot by the cancellation of the claims.

The rejection of claim 1-8, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being anticipated by the Lee II et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,492,360, is made moot by the cancellation of the claims.

The rejection of claim 1, 5-6 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being anticipated by Frisch et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,173,744, is made moot by the cancellation of the claims.

The rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being unpatentable over Frisch et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,173,144, is made moot by the cancellation of the claims.

The rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being unpatentable over Lee II et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,492,360 in view of Gattuso et al. U.S. Patent 6,086,041, is made moot by the cancellation of the claim.

The rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being unpatentable over Frisch et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,173,144 in view of Gattuso et al. U.S. Patent 6,086,041, is made moot by the cancellation of the claim.

The rejection of claim 11-12, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lee II et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,492,360, is made moot by the cancellation of the claims.

The rejection of claim 11-12, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Frisch et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,173,744, is made moot by the cancellation of the claims.

The Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's statement that of claims 16 and 19-26 are allowable.

The Applicants include amendments to the specification to correct a number of typographical errors and to correct errors generated by the word processing software.

Conclusion

The Applicants believe that the application, including claims 16 and 19-26, is now in allowable form. Allowance is therefore respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. LaMarre  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: October 28, 2005

If you have any questions, please contact:  
Mark F. LaMarre, Reg. No. 34,856  
Telephone No. (630) 252-2177